



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,408	07/09/2001	Charles L. Hett	H0001382-US	6452

7590 12/22/2004

Eric G. Halsne
Honeywell International Inc.
P.O. Box 2245
101 Columbia Road
Morristown, NJ 07962

EXAMINER

SEFER, AHMED N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2826

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/901,408

Applicant(s)

HETT ET AL.

Examiner

A. Sefer

Art Unit

2826



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on October 7, 2004 has been entered and claim 6 has been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicants' arguments filed October 7, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Applicants argue that the references of record, Nishida and Orava fail to teach or suggest a plurality of processors being coupled to one or more display units to control data display of the units.

In response to the Applicants' argument, Applicants' attention is drawn to fig. 3 (col. 9, lines 39-67) of Nishida which shows the processor comprising reference numerals 51-53 (the processor was erroneously identified as numeral 60/70) being coupled to one or more display units to control data display of said unit. Similarly, Orava's processor 24 (see col. 5, lines 50-64 and the paragraph bridging cols. 15 and 16) includes row select logic circuit 60, column address logic circuit 62, power supply circuits 70, ADC 56 and signal processing circuits 58 (fig. 5A) performing more than one function including to issue signals to start a process of reading out (col. 12, lines 14-18) and being coupled to one or more display units to control data display of said unit.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2826

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishida USPN 5,767,818.

Nishida discloses in figs. 6-10 a plurality of autonomous liquid crystal display units in a tiled arrangement comprising a top display section and a bottom display section (as in claim 10), each of said units configured to display a data; a housing 200 comprising a structural support 202 and transparent cover 82, said housing substantially surrounding said units; and a channelization system comprising a power supply 60 (as in claim 9) coupled to said units, said channelization system controlling said data display of each of said units; configured to provide a redundant data display comprising substantially the same data display of said unit (as in claim 7), wherein redundant data comprises rerouted data from one of said units to a second unit (as in claim 8), wherein said channelization system comprises a plurality of processors 51-53 (figs. 3, 14 and 18) and each of processors being coupled to one or more units to control said data display of said unit.

As for claim 2, Nishida discloses a structural support system comprising a frame 201 secured to a cavity and enclosing a transparent cover and said units.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2826

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orava et al. ("Orava") USPN 5,812,191 in view of Seraphim.

Orava discloses (see figs. 1-9 and col. 20, lines 23-46) a plurality of autonomous liquid crystal display units in a tiled arrangement comprising a top display section and a bottom display section (as in claim 10), each of said units configured to display a data; a housing 218 comprising a structural support 210, said housing substantially surrounding said units; and a channelization system comprising a power supply 70 (as in claim 9) coupled to said units, said channelization system controlling said data display of each of said units; and configured to provide a redundant data display comprising substantially the same data display on two or more units (as in claim 7), wherein said channelization system comprises a plurality of processors 24 (fig. 5A) and each of processors being coupled to one or more units to control said data display of said unit, but does not specifically disclose a transparent cover.

Seraphim discloses (see figs. 6, 12 and 15 and col. 6, lines 23-31) a plurality of autonomous liquid crystal display units in a tiled arrangement, each of said units configured to display a data; a housing comprising a structural support 62 and transparent cover 50.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Seraphim's teachings with Orava's device since that would provide an environmental protection as taught by Seraphim.

As for claims 2 and 3, Seraphim discloses (see fig. 4, col. 5, lines 25-35 and col. 6, lines 23-31) a structural support system comprising a frame (not shown) secured to a cavity and

Art Unit: 2826

enclosing a transparent cover and said units, wherein said structural support system comprises a carrier 75 having said units disposed therein (as in claim 3).

As for claim 4, Seraphim discloses in figs. 8 and 9 a screen divider (unnumbered) between said cover and said units.

8. Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orava in view of Seraphim as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Motoshima et al. ("Motoshima") USPN 6,271,806.

The combined references disclose the device structure as recited in the claim, but do not specifically disclose substantially same data on two or more units.

Motoshima discloses in figs. 1-3 a plurality of autonomous liquid crystal display units in a tiled arrangement comprising a top display section and a bottom display section (as in claim 10); a channelization system comprising a power supply 200 (as in claim 9) coupled to said units, said channelization system controlling said data display of each of said units and configured to provide a redundant data comprising substantially the same display on two or more units.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Motoshima's teachings since that would allow the display elements to be arranged freely as taught by Motoshima.

As for claim 9, Motoshima discloses redundant data comprising rerouted data from one of said units to a second unit.

As for claims 11-14, Motoshima discloses comprising four liquid crystal display units (as in claim 14); a channelization system comprising at least two channel 105/106 (fig. 3), wherein

Art Unit: 2826

one of said channels being configured to control said top display section and the second of said channel being configured to control said bottom display section (as in claims 12 and 13).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. Sefer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1921.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915.

Art Unit: 2826

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANS

December 19, 2004



NATHAN J. FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800